

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
OXFORD DIVISION**

**STATE OF MISSISSIPPI EX REL LYNN FITCH  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI**

**PLAINTIFF**

**V.**

**No. 3:22-cv-00147-MPM-JMV**

**JEFFREY COURTJAY JACKSON**

**DEFENDANT**

**ORDER**

On October 7, 2022, this court entered an order approving and accepting the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge that this *pro se* action be dismissed as frivolous. Needless to say, when this court dismisses an action as frivolous, that necessarily includes an assessment that the action represents an abuse of the litigation process and a waste of judicial resources. When faced with such a ruling from this court, any plaintiff who feels that his lawsuit has been unjustly dismissed has the option of appealing this court's order to the Fifth Circuit. In this court's experience, however, many *pro se* plaintiffs respond to such an order of dismissal by simply continuing to file more frivolous motions, even though there is, legally speaking, no active lawsuit in which to file them. This court frankly suspects that this practice arises from the fact that many *pro se* litigants simply enjoy making frivolous filings and conclude that it would be preferable to do so in a previously-filed action instead of paying the filing fee for a new lawsuit.

Whatever the reason for this practice, there are exceedingly few circumstances in which it would be proper for this court to waste judicial resources in explaining its rulings dismissing any additional motions filed by a plaintiff who 1) has already seen his action dismissed as frivolous

and 2) has not obtained any appellate ruling casting doubt upon that dismissal. In this case, plaintiff responded to the dismissal with four additional motions, namely two motions to reconsider, a motion for recusal and a motion for Temporary Restraining Order. The latter order seeks various relief, including an order from this court stripping a state court of its federal funding and a state court judge of his license to practice law. [Docket entry 18 at 8]. This court concludes that each of these motions are frivolous and that none of them fall within the limited circumstances in which it would be proper for it to explain its reasons for so concluding in a written opinion. These motions will therefore simply be dismissed.

It is therefore ordered that various motions filed by plaintiff [14-1,15-1,16-1 and 18-1] are dismissed as frivolous.

So ordered, this, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2023.

/s/Michael P. Mills  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI